

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 and 27 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to remove the option that the working electrode borders the attachment zone.

No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 12 and 27 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(b) citing Thorp, Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 12 and 27 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(b) citing Choong, and the claims remain rejected 35 USC 103(a) citing Choong or Thorp in view of Segev. In light of the amendments submitted herein, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

In the microelectronic device of Thorp, the immobilized capture probes (22) which correspond to the attachment zone according to the present invention surround the conductive electrode (21).

In addition, Choong indicates at column 9, lines 38-41 that “[f]or instance, at least one of the electrodes can be placed directly on a surface of the substrate, so long as it does not contact the buffer, and/or the sample contained in the buffer.”

The Examiner considers that both Thorp and Choong anticipate the claims based on an interpretation of the working electrode as bordering the attachment zone.

However, neither Thorp nor Choong discloses a device according to the amended claim 1 where the working electrode surrounds the attachment zone.

Therefore, claims 1-12 and 27-28 are not anticipated by Thorp or Choong.

Withdrawal of both rejections is requested.

Segev discloses a method for amplifying and detecting single or double-stranded target nucleic acid molecules or a minute sequence alteration (single base pair alteration) in a

test sample. Segev also discloses a kit for implementing this method that includes two or more oligonucleotide probes complementary pairs and at least one buffer (column 10, lines 60-64). The method object of Segev invention is implemented in solution, which is confirmed at figure 27 and by the terms “test tubes” (column 10, line 66), “test vessel” (column 11, line 47) and “surrounding solution” (column 11, line 53). Molecules attached on a support can also be used in this method “the counterpart affinity separation moiety S’ is preferably attached to a solid support’ and figure 27.

However, Segev does not disclose a device related to those in Throp or in Choong which are devices with attachment zone, with working electrode and with counterelectrode and, even less, a device into which the working electrode surrounds the attachment zone.

Therefore, Segev does not compensate for the core deficiencies of Choong and Thorp and as such claims 1-12 and 27-28 are not obvious in view of the cited combination of art. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

A Notice of Allowance is also requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)